

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 13 2006

McDermott
Will & EmeryBoston Brussels Chicago Düsseldorf London Los Angeles Miami Munich
New York Orange County Rome San Diego Silicon Valley Washington, D.C.

FACSIMILE

Date: June 13, 2006

Time Sent:

To:	Company:	Facsimile No:	Telephone No:
Examiner Michelle K. Lay	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	571-273-8300	
From:	Elizabeth E. Kim	Direct Phone:	617.535.4411
E-Mail:	ekim@mwe.com	Direct Fax:	617.535.3800
Sent By:		Direct Phone:	
Client/Matter/Tkpr:		Original to Follow by Mail:	No
		Number of Pages, Including Cover:	2
Re:	10/647,932		

Message:

Dear Examiner Lay:

Thank you for your voicemail this afternoon in which you agreed to grant a telephone interview tomorrow afternoon or Friday regarding the above-mentioned case.

As you indicated in your voicemail, I will call you tomorrow to set up the time for the phone interview. Meanwhile, I am faxing you a one-page summary of the main points I would like to address during the interview.

Thank you.

Elizabeth Kim

The information contained in this facsimile message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copy of this facsimile is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the below address by mail. Thank you.

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Main Facsimile: 617.535.3800 Facsimile Operator: 617.535.4000

U.S. practice conducted through McDermott Will & Emery LLP.
28 State Street Boston, Massachusetts 02109-1775 Telephone: 617.535.4000

JUN 13 2006

Summary of Issues for Telephone Interview Re:
US Patent Application No. 10/647,932

- 103(a) rejection of claims 1-20 and 29 over Richey in view of Oshima
(Final Office Action, May 03, 2006)

The Office Action of May 03, 2006 did not address a key limitation in rejected independent claim 1 that distinguishes Applicant's application with the cited references and Applicant's application, namely:

"a processing system ... configured to deliver ... a sequence of images, the content of which are a function of ... a plurality of displacement steps taken by the individual within the structure."

Neither Richey nor Oshima discloses a processing system that delivers a sequence of images, the content of which are a function of a plurality of displacements steps taken by the individual.

The Office Action also did not state that either Richey or Oshima discloses such a feature. However, the limitation set forth above was not address in the 103(a) rejection.

Because neither Richey nor Oshima, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-mentioned limitation of claim 1, claim 1 (and all claims dependent thereon) are not obvious under 35 USC 103 over Richey in view of Oshima.

- 102(b) rejection of claim 32 over Richey 5,310,794 (Final Office Action, May 03, 2006)

Claim 32 requires images be delivered to at least one of a set of modular walls, and the contents of these delivered images are required to vary based on the interaction between the individual and the environment.

The following limitation was not addressed in the Office Action:

"a set of modular walls ... at least one of the walls being a computer-controlled displayand a processing system ... configured to deliver to the display one or more images whose contents change based on the interaction between the individual and the environment"

This limitation is lacking in Richey. Nothing in Richey teaches or suggests that the images delivered to one or more modular walls change as a result of the interaction between the viewer and the environment.

The Office Action also did not state that Richey teaches such a feature. This feature is not found anywhere in Richey. The Office Action only stated that the contents of the images, as viewed through a head mounted display, changes as the viewer/operator moves his head. However, a head mounted display is evidently not one of a set of modular walls, and therefore the above-described limitation of claim 32 is not met by Richey. Therefore, Richey does not anticipate Claim 32 under 35 USC 102(b).